

In the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho

IN RE: AMENDMENT OF IDAHO COURT
ADMINISTRATIVE RULE (I.C.A.R.) 32

ORDER AMENDING
RULE

The Court having reviewed the report and recommendations of the Rule 32 (E-Records) Committee and the Administrative Conference to amend Idaho Court Administrative Rule 32,

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Idaho Court Administrative Rule 32, as it appears in the volume published by the Idaho Code Commission, be, and is hereby, amended as follows:

Rule 32. Records of the judicial department – Examination and copying – Exemption from and limitations on disclosure.

(g) **Court records exempt from disclosure.** Except as provided in paragraph (h) of this rule, court records specified below are confidential and are exempt from disclosure. Any willful or intentional disclosure of a confidential court record may be treated as a contempt of court.

(1) Documents and records to which access is otherwise restricted by state or federal law;

(2) Pre-sentence investigation reports, except as provided in Idaho Criminal Rule 32;

(3) Affidavits or sworn testimony and records of proceedings in support of the issuance of search or arrest warrant pending the return of the warrant;

(4) Unreturned search warrants;

(5) Unreturned arrest warrants, except bench warrants, or summonses in a criminal case, provided that they the arrest warrants or summonses may be disclosed by law enforcement agencies at their discretion;

(17) Records maintained by a court that are gathered at the request or under the auspices of a court (other than records that have been admitted in evidence);

(A) to determine an individual's need for counseling, rehabilitation, treatment or assistance with personal conflicts;

(B) to assist in assigning an appropriate disposition in the case, including the ADR screening report and screening reports prepared by Family Court Service coordinators or their designees;

(h) Permissive Release of Judicial Decision in Exempted

Categories. Records of courts' determinations in proceedings exempt from disclosure under (g) of this rule may, by direction of the court issuing the determination, be subject to inspection, examination and copying in a manner that preserves the anonymity of the participants to the proceeding. In particular, the Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals may provide copies of their rulings in appeals from proceedings exempt from disclosure under paragraph (g) by using "John Doe/Jane Doe" designations or other anonymous designations in documents made available for inspection, examination and copying. Further deletions from the decisions may be made if necessary to preserve anonymity.

(i) Other Prohibitions or Limitations on Disclosure and Motions Regarding the Sealing of Records. Physical and electronic records, may be disclosed, or temporarily or permanently sealed or redacted by order of the court on a case-by-case basis. Any interested person or the court on its own motion may move to disclose, redact, seal or unseal a part or all of the records in any judicial proceeding. The custodian judge shall hold a hearing on the motion after the moving party gives notice of the hearing to all parties to the judicial proceeding and any other interested party designated by the custodian judge. In ruling on whether specific records should be disclosed, redacted or sealed by order of the court, the court shall determine and make a finding of fact as to whether the interest in privacy or public disclosure predominates. If the court redacts or seals records to protect predominating privacy interests, it must fashion the least restrictive exception from disclosure consistent with privacy interests. Before a court may enter an order redacting or sealing records, it must also make one or more of the following determinations in writing:

(1) That the documents or materials contain highly intimate facts or statements, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, or

(2) That the documents or materials contain facts or statements that the court finds might be libelous, or

(3) That the documents or materials contain facts or statements, the dissemination or publication of which would reasonably result in economic or financial loss or harm to a person having an interest in the

documents or materials, or compromise the security of personnel, records or public property of or used by the judicial department, or

(4) That the documents or materials contain facts or statements that might threaten or endanger the life or safety of individuals-, or

(5) That it is necessary to temporarily seal or redact the documents or materials to preserve the right to a fair trial.

In applying these rules, the court is referred to the traditional legal concepts in the law of the right to a fair trial, invasion of privacy, defamation, and invasion of proprietary business records as well as common sense respect for shielding highly intimate material about persons. When a record is sealed under this rule, it shall not be subject to examination, inspection or copying by the public. When the court issues an order sealing or redacting records, the court shall also inform the Clerk of the District Court of which specific files, documents and ISTARs records are to be sealed or redacted. Sealed files shall be marked "sealed" on the outside of the file. Sealed or redacted records shall be placed in a manila envelope marked "sealed" with a general description of the records, their filing date and date they were sealed or redacted. When a file has been ordered sealed, or when records within a file have been ordered sealed or redacted, the electronic record shall reflect such action and shall be limited accordingly. When the court issues an order redacting records for purposes of public disclosure, the records in the court file or in the custody of the court shall not be altered in any fashion. The originals shall be placed in a manila envelope marked "sealed" with a general description of the records, and a redacted copy, so marked, shall be substituted for the originals in the court file. An order directing that records be redacted or sealed shall be subject to examination, inspection or copying by the public to the extent that such disclosure does not reveal the information that the court sought to protect in issuing the order. The decision on a motion to redact, seal or unseal records may be reconsidered, altered or amended by the court at any time. When the court issues an order disclosing otherwise exempt records, it shall place appropriate limitations on the dissemination of that information.

(j) Request for Records.

(4) Response to Request. The custodian shall respond to a request for examination of public records. Within three (3) working days from receipt of request, the custodian shall disclose the records requested, refer the request to the custodian judge for determination, or give written notice of denial of the request. Provided, if the custodian determines that it will take more than three (3) working days to determine whether the request should be granted, or that a longer period of time is needed to locate or retrieve the requested records, the custodian shall so notify the person making the request, and the response shall then be made by the custodian

within ten (10) working days following the date of the request. If the documents requested are disclosed by the custodian, no other notice need be given by the custodian. The custodian is not under a duty to compile or summarize information contained in records, nor is the custodian obligated to create new records for the requesting party, except as provided herein. The custodian may deny a request for a copy of all or part of a transcript of an administrative or judicial proceeding or other voluminous publication or document when by rule or statute it may be obtained from the preparer of such record after payment of a fee. Efforts should be made to respond promptly to requests for records.

(5) Response by Custodian Judge. If a custodian determines that there is a question as to whether records should be disclosed pursuant to a request, or if a request is made for a ruling by a judge after the custodian denies the request, the custodian shall refer the request to the custodian judge for determination. The custodian judge shall make a written determination as to whether the records should be disclosed within ten (10) working days following the request. In the sole discretion of the custodian judge, an informal hearing may be held by the custodian judge on the question of whether the records should be disclosed. The custodian judge shall determine the time and place of the hearing and the notice to be given by the custodian to the person requesting the records and any other interested person. If a hearing is held under this rule, the response to the person requesting the record may be delayed a reasonable time after the conclusion of the hearing.

(6) Cost of Copying Records. The cost to make a paper copy of any record filed in a case with the clerk of the district court shall be as specified in I.C. § 31-3201. The cost for any other copying of any record shall be ~~the actual cost as designated~~ determined by order of the Supreme Court or the Administrative District Judge in accordance with the provisions of I.C. § 9-338(8). The costs so determined shall be paid, in advance, by the person requesting the records. Any delay in paying the costs of copying the records shall extend the time for response by the custodian. In the event that a person wishes to have a copy of a court record that can be easily copied to digital media by court personnel, the person making that request shall provide the appropriate media to the court for that purpose.

(7) Proceedings after Denial. If a custodian denies a request for the examination or copying of records, the aggrieved party may file a request for a ruling by the custodian judge. If the custodian judge denies a request for the examination or copying of records, the sole remedy of any aggrieved person shall be to institute proceedings for disclosure in the district court in accordance with I.C. § 9-343.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that this order and these amendments shall be effective the 1st day of February, 2009.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the above designation of the striking of words from the Rules by lining through them, and the designation of the addition of new portions of the Rules by underlining such new portion is for the purposes of information only as amended, and NO OTHER AMENDMENTS ARE INTENDED. The lining through and underlining shall not be considered a part of the permanent Idaho Court Administrative Rules.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the Clerk of the Court shall cause notice of this Order to be published in one issue of *The Advocate*.

DATED this 30 day of December, 2008

By Order of the Supreme Court



Daniel T. Eismann,
Chief Justice

ATTEST: Stephen Kenyon
Clerk

I, Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Idaho, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the Order entered in the above entitled cause and now on record in my office.
WITNESS my hand and the Seal of this Court 116109

STEPHEN W. KENYON

Clerk

By: Kimberly Grove Deputy